

An Alternative Hypothesis Concerning the Nature of the Cosmic Microwave Background

16 June 2023

Simon Edwards

Research Acceleration Initiative

Introduction

Current doctrine holds that the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) is a remnant of the theoretical “big bang” event which may have, according to the currently prevailing theory, been associated with the birth of our Universe. This theory of CMB is deeply flawed, a fact that should be self-evident given that the expansion of galaxies transpires at sub-light speeds and any radiation generated during the “big bang” would necessarily have passed beyond the most distant galaxies mere moments after this theorized event. Since these microwaves would be traveling only through empty space (and only outward,) there would be no plausible mechanism through which these microwaves could have their linear momentum inverted so that we might observe them. If the “big bang” event occurred, there would be no possibility of any civilization in any galaxy intercepting these microwaves as they passed beyond the outer limits of the dispersed physical matter of the Universe at the outset.

Abstract

Much more likely is that the microwaves emanating from the outer limits of our Universe owe their existence to an ongoing, low-intensity matter-antimatter reaction. To better understand why this is the case, one should read the publication concerning “the Universe as a photon-exciton collision in a higher dimensional plane.” That postulation specifies that our entire Universe consists of positively charged empty space (an nanoscopic exciton as seen from a higher dimension) and that all of both the matter and energy in our Universe, be it positively or negatively charged from our perspective, is in fact composed purely of negative electrical energy derived from a photon (in a higher dimensional plane.) As this photon and exciton merge, high concentrations of energy diffuse rapidly, thus accounting for the observed expansion of the galaxies in our Universe.

Beyond the boundaries of this Universe; the parameters of our Universe being defined as the parameters of that exciton; exists further space, and ultimately, other Universes (excitons.) The neutrally charged space between these Universe-Excitons does not consist of as much clashing positive and negative electrical energy as is found within these Photon-Exciton merger events (Universes.)

Consequently, things like protons and neutrons may indeed be found in inter-Universal space in much the same way they can be found in inter-galactic space (in theory.) Crucially, these inter-Universal protons would have a different

energy level with regard to the orbital behavior of the three-quark systems that comprise protons and neutrons. The true nature of protons and anti-protons is poorly understood by today's physicists. In previous publications, I have endeavored to explain the differences between electrons and positrons (a form of what we term matter and antimatter) but have not, as yet, been able to define, even in theory, what underpins the differences between protons and anti-protons, or for that matter, what is actually transpiring within protons of any sort. As of today, however, this has changed. While in this publication, my focus is on correcting some misconceptions regarding the CMB, in my next publication (to be published later today just below this one) I will explain the true dynamics of protons, anti-protons, neutrons, and anti-neutrons. That work was done so as to create a more complete model of physics and a companion publication for this relatively terse publication concerning the CMB.

The Nature of Anti-Matter and How It Differs from Ordinary Matter

Although I will reserve a more detailed explanation for my next publication (forthcoming later today,) I will provide at least a brief synopsis of that theory within this publication as I feel it is necessary in order to justify the hypothesis that forms the central pillar of the argument laid out in the Abstract.

The current Standard Model of physics suggests, without actually explaining the internal dynamics of either protons or anti-protons, that there exists particles known as anti-down and anti-up quarks. These particles do not exist. The fact that anti-matter can be created in a laboratory setting is suggestive of a mechanical difference between protons and anti-protons as opposed to a difference in an as-yet undiscovered electrical-charge-like property. In a previous publication, I specified that the difference between an electron and a positron lies in the fact that axis spin within an electron is counter-Magnusian (relative to phase) with the electron spinning at varying speeds in which the fastest spin rate is mid-phase and there is a zero spin-rate at the peaks of phase. This stands in contrast with positrons, which I theorized have a Magnusian relationship with regard to phase. In a positron, spin rate is constant and phase does not exist. Rather than phasing up and down, the spin orientation gradually rotates, resulting in a particle that corkscrews as it travels through space rather than moving in a linear direction while oscillating slightly.

The use of the term "positron" has only led physicists further astray as it has led to a fundamental assumption that electrical charge differentials are central to the energetic matter-antimatter reaction. Although positrons have an apparent positive electrical charge, this has nothing to do with the energy released during the annihilation of an electron and a positron, much less a proton and anti-proton.

I propose that the only difference between a proton and an anti-proton lies in the level of energy with which the "up" quarks (of which there are two) circulate around the "down" quark, which acts as to stabilize the trios. I propose that the revolution of these "up" quarks (in the case of protons) around the central

“down” quark may occur at varying speeds, but that once this speed is set, it is difficult to alter. I propose that anti-protons are nothing more than protons generated from interacting streams of gluons that are less energetic i.e. they come from non-relativistic neutrons, as opposed to the classical protons created at the outset of the Universe. Physicists, to date, have never created a proton in a laboratory. They harvest them from hydrogen and other elements (as they do with neutrons,) but they have not created a proton. Despite this, they have somehow created anti-protons. This fact is revelatory in this author’s mind as it is obvious that experiments involving particle accelerators, however powerful they may be, lack the power of the “big bang.” This fact is suggestive to this author of an entirely alternative hypothesis concerning the nature of anti-matter.

I propose that this anti-matter; in the case of nucleons such as protons; are nothing more than protons with circulating “up” quarks that revolve around their “down” quarks (which remain in a relative stationary position) with less speed and energy than in classical protons.

Importantly, the extent to which quarks of like-type repel or attract one another (in accordance with Coulomb’s principles) is dictated, unlike with higher-order particle types such as protons and electrons, not by charge differential and proximity, but rather, dimensions of velocity and proximity.

As a consequence of this difference, protons with lower-energy quarks have a weaker mutual repulsion with the exterior quarks of full-strength protons and are capable of penetrating the barrier created by the rapidly moving exterior quarks of the classical proton. When this occurs, the delicate balance of the proton’s exterior quarks is thrown into chaos much as a flywheel that goes out of balance. When this occurs, the quarks of both the so-called proton and anti-proton break from orbit around the anchoring “down” quarks and all of the associated quarks are emitted in an outward direction as radiative energy. Whereas the energy from both fission and fusion reactions lies ultimately in the generation of gluons, resulting in particle acceleration (ibid. previous publication) the energy released in matter-antimatter reactions results from the liberation of energy vested in quark systems A.K.A. “protons” at the outset of the Universe. Fission and fusion both ultimately owe their energetic output to the sub-nucleonic, however, in both of those cases, nucleonic chain reactions are the triggering event. Although quarks are manifested from interacting gluons, sustained fusion reactions based upon gluons and odderons are quite distinct from matter-antimatter reactions. With this understanding, it should be possible to obtain more energy, incidentally, from matter-antimatter reactions that one must invest to create anti-matter as the majority of the energy released in such reactions is, in reality, vested in protons at the outset of the Universe.

Conclusion

In order for microwave energy sc. The CMB to be directed from the outer limits of our Universe toward the Earth, energetic reactions from the collision of matter and anti-matter must occur on a continual basis at this boundary. This

may be explained by my novel hypothesis which defines anti-matter as nucleons featuring exterior quarks with lower-than-ordinary energies which are consequently capable of merging with classical protons and throwing the delicate balance of the classical proton's quarks into disarray, resulting in the dissolution of both particles and energetic release.

To learn more about the interior dynamics of protons and anti-protons, please read the following publication.